

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated May 4, 2007 (hereinafter Office Action) have been considered. Claims 51-93 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

Claims 51, 66-72 and 79-81 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 03/003767 to Soininen (hereinafter "*Soininen*") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0172338 by Lee (hereinafter "*Lee*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, and submit that the claims as previously presented are not rendered obvious by the combination of *Soininen* and *Lee*. However, in order to facilitate prosecution of the application and in a bona fide attempt to advance the application to allowance, the Applicants present this response with amendment to clarify particular aspects of the claimed invention.

Particular claims have been amended to at least set forth that a routing number is used to obtain a dynamic conference number from a server that facilitates multiparty peer-to-peer communications. The dynamic conference number is included in circuit switched bearer information of a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) message used to establish a connection via a circuit switched network. These amendments are fully supported in the Applicants' Specification as originally filed (e.g., Specification, page 13, line 24 to page 14, line 2). In addition, newly added Claims 89-93 recite various features of multimedia caller line identification that were previously claimed, and therefore these newly added claims are also fully supported by the Specification as filed.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Soininen* nor *Lee* teach the use of a routing number in a SIP message to obtain a dynamic conference number for establishing multiparty peer-to-peer communications via a circuit switched network. Further, the combination of *Soininen* and *Lee* fail to suggest such a use of a routing number, at least because neither reference is directed to the use of multiparty conferencing via circuit switched networks. Therefore, Claims 51, 66-72 and 79-81 are allowable over the

combination of *Soininen* and *Lee* at least because the combination of references fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations.

Claims 52-61, 64, 73-76 and 84-88 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Soininen* in view of *Lee*, and further in view of “SDP: Session Description Protocol” by Handley et al. (hereinafter “*Handley*”). Claims 62-63, 65, 77-78 and 82-83 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Soininen* in view of *Lee*, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0120505 by Kotzin (hereinafter “*Kotzin*”). Applicants respectfully traverse rejections, and submit that the claims as previously presented are not rendered obvious by the combinations of *Soininen* /*Lee*/*Handley* or *Soininen*/*Lee*/ *Kotzin*. Nonetheless, Applicants submit that these rejections are now moot in view of the amendments to independent Claims 51, 71, and 81, from which Claims 52-65, 73-78, and 82-88 respectively depend.

As argued above, the combination of *Soininen* and *Lee* fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended Claims 51, 71, and 81. Further, neither *Handley* nor *Kotzin* were relied upon to teach routing number in a SIP message to obtain a dynamic conference number for establishing multiparty peer-to-peer communications via a circuit switched network, nor do *Handley* or *Kotzin* teach or suggest such features. Thus, the combination of *Soininen*, *Lee*, and *Handley* at least fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of Claims 52-61, 64, 73-76 and 84-88, and the combination of *Soininen*, *Lee*, and *Kotzin* fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of Claims 62-63, 65, 77-78 and 82-83.

It is to be understood that the Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner’s characterization of the asserted art or the Applicant’s claimed subject matter, nor of the Examiner’s application of the asserted art or combinations thereof to the Applicant’s claimed subject matter. Moreover, the Applicants do not acquiesce to any explicit or implicit statements or conclusions by the Examiner concerning what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, obvious design choices, alternative equivalent arrangements, common knowledge at the time of the Applicant’s invention, officially noticed facts, and the like. The Applicants respectfully submit that a detailed discussion of

each of the Examiner's rejections beyond that provided above is not necessary, in view of the clear absence of teaching and suggestion of various features recited in the Applicant's pending claims. The Applicants, however, reserve the right to address in detail the Examiner's characterizations, conclusions, and rejections in future prosecution.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (NOKM.079PA) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the undersigned attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC  
8009 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, Suite 125  
Minneapolis, MN 55425  
952.854.2700

Date: July 30, 2007

By: 

William B. Ashley  
Reg. No. 51,419